

**REMARKS**

These Remarks are responsive to the Office Action mailed January 12, 2004 ("Office Action"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections of claims 1-45 for at least the following reasons.

**STATUS OF THE CLAIMS**

Claims 1-45 are pending in the application.

No new matter is added by this response.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Office Action states that claim 12 is objected to because the word "control" is missing the first character "c". Upon entry of the above amendments, claim 12 has been amended to correct this informality.

The Office Action states that claim 41 is not objected to but that the text could be indented along with the other claims. Accordingly, claim 41 has been listed in the above claim listing to be indented uniformly with the other claims.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

The Office Action states that claim 38 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Office Action states that the recitation of the limitation "said serial ports" has insufficient basis. Accordingly, upon entry of the above amendments, claim 38 has been amended to change "said serial ports" to recite "said communication ports". Applicant respectfully submits that there is sufficient antecedent basis for "said communication ports" in claim 30--from which claim 38 is dependent.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Office Action states that claims 1-4, 7, 9-10, 11-14, 17, 19-20, 30, 36, 40-42 and 44-45 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,781,549, issued to Dai (“Dai”).

Upon entry of the above amendments, claim 1-45 have been amended to even more clearly distinguish over Dai. Applicant respectfully submits that Dai fails to disclose or teach all of the limitations and elements of the present invention as recited in claims 1-45. For example, the independent claims (claims 1, 11, 22, 30, and 40) recite “plural communication serial ports”. Dai does not disclose or teach this element of “plural communication serial ports”.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that Dai does not anticipate claims 1-45, under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as Dai does not teach or disclose all of the limitations and elements of claims 1-45.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Dai/Rostoker

The Office Action states that claims 5, 15, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-34, and 38-39 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Dai in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,554, issued to Rostoker et al. (“Rostoker”).

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Dai and Rostoker is improper as there is no teaching in either Dai or Rostoker that would prompt one of skill in the art to attempt their combination. Each reference is a complete disclosure of an invention in its own right. No further unsolved problems are discussed in Dai or Rostoker, other than the immediate problems that their inventions presume to solve. Accordingly, one of skill of the art would not have been prompted to attempt to combine the teachings and disclosure of Dai and Rostoker to attempt to

reach the elements and limitations of the present invention.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 5, 15, 22-24, 26, 28-29, 31-34, and 38-39 as allegedly being unpatentable over Dai in combination with Rostoker is improper. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be removed from the application.

Dai/Lin

The Office Action states that claims 6 and 16 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Dai in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,937,817, issued to Lin (“Lin”).

Even assuming that the teachings and disclosure of Dai and Lin can be combined, the combined teachings and disclosure of Dai and Lin fail to reach all the limitations and elements of the present invention as recited in claims 6 and 16. As discussed above, claims 6 and 16 recite “plural communication serial ports”. This element is not taught or disclosed by Dai. This deficiency is not remedied by the teaching and disclosure of Lin.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Dai and Lin--either by themselves or in combination--fail to teach and/or disclose all the limitations and elements as recited in claims 6 and 16. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of these rejections from the application.

Dai

The Office Action states that claim 21 is rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Dai.

As discussed above, claim 21 recites “plural communication serial ports”. This element is not taught or disclosed by Dai. As such, Dai fails to teach and/or disclose all the limitations and elements as recited in claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of this rejection from the application.

Dai/Rostoker/Lin

The Office Action states that claims 25 and 35 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Dai in view of Rostoker in further view of Lin.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Dai, Rostoker, and Lin is improper as there is no teaching in either Dai or Rostoker that would prompt one of skill in the art to attempt their combination. As discussed above, the combination of Dai and Rostoker is improper as neither reference provides a reason to attempt their combination. Likewise, Lin does not provide a reason to attempt a combination of Lin with either Dai or Rostoker--much less both of these references. For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the rejections of claims 25 and 35 as allegedly being unpatentable over Dai in combination with Rostoker and Lin is improper. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be removed from the application.

**CONCLUSION**

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests a notice of allowance for the pending claims. Should the Examiner determine that any further action is necessary to place this application in condition for allowance the Examiner is kindly requested and encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned representative at the number listed below.

In the event any other fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the undersigned's Deposit Account No. 50-0206.

Date:

July 12, 2004

By:

Respectfully submitted,

David H. Milligan

Robert M. Schulman  
Registration No. 31,196

David H. Milligan  
Registration No. 42,893

HUNTON & WILLIAMS LLP  
Intellectual Property Department  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Suite 1200  
Washington, D.C. 20006-1109  
(202) 955-1500 (telephone)  
(202) 778-2201 (facsimile)

h